UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs. 11-CR-602

JOSEPH JENKINS,

Defendant.

-----X

Transcript of SENTENCING held on

November 12, 2014, at the James Hanley Federal Building,

100 South Clinton Street, Syracuse, New York,

the HONORABLE GLENN T. SUDDABY, Presiding.

APPEARANCES

For Plaintiff: OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

100 South Clinton Street

James Hanley Federal Building

Syracuse, New York 13261 BY: TAMARA THOMSON, Esq.

Assistant United States Attorney

For Defendant: OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER

The Clinton Exchange - 3rd Floor

4 Clinton Square

Syracuse, New York 13202 BY: LISA PEEBLES, ESQ.

```
(Open court, 10:05 a.m.)
1
               THE CLERK: Case number 5:11-CR-602, United States
 2
 3
     of America versus Joseph Vincent Jenkins.
               Counsel, please note your appearance for the
 4
 5
    record.
               MS. THOMSON: Good morning, your Honor, Tamara
 6
     Thomson and Gwen Carroll on behalf of the United States and
 7
 8
     also in the courtroom is the case agent Chad Willard and the
 9
     Canadian case agent Detective Constable Kip Wohlert
10
     (phonetic).
11
               THE COURT: Good morning.
12
               MS. PEEBLES: Good morning, your Honor, Lisa
13
    Peebles appearing on behalf of Joseph Jenkins. Mr. Jenkins
14
     is also present.
15
               THE COURT: Good morning.
16
               We're here for sentencing this morning.
17
               Are counsel ready to proceed?
18
               MS. THOMSON: Yes, your Honor.
19
               MS. PEEBLES: Yes.
20
               THE COURT: Ms. Peebles, Mr. Jenkins submitted a
2.1
     request this past week -- it was filed on November 5th --
22
     concerning a new attorney. I don't know if you had an
23
     opportunity to discuss that with him before this morning.
24
               MS. PEEBLES: Well, Judge, I had an opportunity to
2.5
    review the document and he and I had spoken at length on the
```

2.1

2.2

2.5

phone prior to him filing that request. And the indication that I'm getting today is that Mr. Jenkins is not satisfied with the submissions that I've put in on his behalf to this point. So I'll leave it up to the Court as to what the Court would like to do.

I know Mr. Jenkins is objecting to much of the, first and foremost, the special conditions of supervised release and, in addition, much of what's contained in the presentence report and his belief that the Court should recuse itself from hearing the sentencing in this matter and he filed a supplemental sentencing submission on September 9th of 2014, which I believe has been docketed with the Court. I had an opportunity to review all those submissions by Mr. Jenkins.

I have my own objections, to some degree, and I put in documents on behalf of Mr. Jenkins but, as far as what the Court intends to do this morning, I would leave it up to your discretion.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Jenkins, you've submitted this motion and you've requested a new attorney. We're at sentencing at this point. All the submissions by defense counsel have been made. You have made submissions. I've reviewed them.

Are you prepared to retain counsel before proceeding with sentencing?

2.1

2.5

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not really sure I can retain counsel at this point.

THE COURT: Well, then, at this point what we're going to do is I'm going to proceed with sentencing. All the submissions have been made. You'll have an opportunity to be heard. I reviewed all of your submissions and, if there's anything else that you'd like to add this morning, certainly you'll have an opportunity to do that. So we're going to proceed.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I mean, I've pretty much demanded that -- I don't feel you have any right to sentence me after all these antics and there's a lot of screwing around here and I don't agree with it and I've repeatedly asked Ms. Peebles here to file a petition to have you removed and I think that there's grounds for it. I've been going over submissions the last few weeks and court transcripts. I mean, that's what I want. I'd rather -- I mean, you've set a record that -- I mean, she hasn't done what I've asked her to do. We've been going around for a few months arguing.

THE COURT: Mr. Jenkins, no attorney's done --

THE DEFENDANT: What's that?

THE COURT: No attorney's done what you've asked them to do, according to you, despite being represented by a number of different counselors. You started with Mr. Parry. You referred to him as an idiot and not knowing what he was

2.1

2.2

2.5

doing. The Court sent numerous attorneys to meet with you in the jail so you could retain someone. You made derogatory comments about the people that were very well-regarded in this community, legal community, as far as representing federal defendants. Then we provided you with a list of CJA attorneys that are admitted to the Northern District of New York to give you an opportunity to retain somebody. You did retain an Aaron Goldsmith out of New York who represented you at trial and then he requested to be relieved because of his irreconcilable differences with you and not being able to get along with you. And then, you know, the federal public defender's office was assigned by Judge Peebles and has represented you, in this Court's view, in a very capable and competent manner and here we are again.

So, sir, you can demand all you want. You can criticize. You can blame everybody else. You can say it's the attorney's fault. But we're at a point, sir, where we're going to proceed with sentencing. You have counsel. You've been represented well and you've had an opportunity to submit everything that you've wanted to to this Court and I've reviewed everything that you submitted, despite its derogatory tone and comments, disrespectful comments to this Court and everybody else that you've had to deal with, sir.

So, you'll be given a full opportunity to say anything you want. If you're not going to retain somebody,

```
certainly this Court is not going appoint another attorney to
1
     represent you at this point. So you --
 2
               THE DEFENDANT: At this point I don't --
 3
 4
               THE COURT: So you can proceed by representing
 5
     yourself today. That's up to you, sir, but we're going to
 6
    proceed with sentencing.
               THE DEFENDANT: Well, at this point, then, I
 7
     request my other attorney, Mr. Goldsmith, be ordered back on
 8
 9
    the case.
10
               THE COURT: Sir, he requested -- he requested -- to
11
     be relieved because he could not get along with you and did
12
    not agree with the things that you were demanding that he do.
13
               THE DEFENDANT: Because I insisted he did some
14
    work.
15
               THE COURT: Okay.
16
               THE DEFENDANT: And to fix his mistakes.
17
               THE COURT: Okay.
18
               THE DEFENDANT: But I didn't agree with him being
19
     released.
20
               THE COURT: Well, sir, you didn't have to agree to
2.1
    have him released. He requested and the Court granted him,
22
    based on the motion that he made and the papers that he put
23
     in in this matter. So we're going to proceed.
24
               Counsel, have you received the presentence report
```

Counsel, have you received the presentence report that was dated April 11th, 2014, and the addendum which is

2.5

7

US v. Jenkins - 11-CR-602

```
dated May 20th, 2014?
1
               Government receive those?
 2
               MS. THOMSON: Yes, your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: Ms. Peebles, did you receive those?
 4
 5
               MS. PEEBLES: I have, your Honor, and Mr. Jenkins
    has just voiced his concern that he disagrees with everything
 6
 7
     that I'm doing and I'm in a bit of conundrum right now as to
 8
    how I should proceed.
 9
               THE COURT: I'm just going to ask you some
10
    background questions as to what you did with Mr. Jenkins and
11
     then we'll let him do what he'd like to do with regard to
12
     sentencing.
13
               MS. PEEBLES: Yes, Judge.
14
               THE COURT: Did you receive those documents?
15
               MS. PEEBLES: I did.
16
               THE COURT: And did you have an opportunity to
17
    review them or share them with Mr. Jenkins?
               MS. PEEBLES: I have.
18
19
               THE COURT: Very well. Thank you.
20
               Mr. Jenkins, did you see those documents, did you
2.1
    review them, the presentence report and the addendum?
2.2
               THE DEFENDANT: I mean, there's inaccurate
23
     information in there.
24
               THE COURT: That was not my question, sir.
2.5
               Did you see those documents and did you review
```

3

US v. Jenkins - 11-CR-602

```
them?
1
 2
               THE DEFENDANT: The presentence report, yes.
 3
               THE COURT: And did you see the addendum, sir,
     which was dated May 20th, 2014?
 4
 5
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
               THE COURT: Very well.
 6
               The Court has also received a letter from Bonnie
 7
 8
     and George Jenkins, which was dated May 25th, 2014.
 9
               Did the government receive a copy of that
10
     correspondence?
11
               MS. THOMSON: Yes, your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: Very well.
13
               Does the government have any objections to the
14
     facts as stated in the presentence report?
15
               MS. THOMSON: No, your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: Ms. Peebles, did you have an
17
     opportunity to look at the facts as stated in the presentence
18
     report and the review it with Mr. Jenkins?
19
               MS. PEEBLES: Yes, your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: Now, Mr. Jenkins, you have objections
2.1
     to the facts as stated in the presentence report; is that
2.2
     correct?
23
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
24
               THE COURT: And do you want to make any further
2.5
     record as to what those objections are at this point? You
```

```
submitted some things in writing. Do you want to add
1
 2
     anything?
 3
               THE DEFENDANT: I mean, I think -- I just think
     this whole thing is ridiculous and I request a competent
 4
 5
     attorney to -- this is foolish. I mean, I don't -- I don't
     really know what you're doing here. I mean, I...
 6
               THE COURT: My question is, sir: Do you have
 7
     objections to the facts as stated --
 8
 9
               THE DEFENDANT: I object to everything. Yes, I
10
     object to everything.
11
              THE COURT: Very well.
12
              Counsel for the government, any objections to the
13
     offense level calculations in the presentence report?
14
              MS. THOMSON: No, your Honor, with the noted
15
     addition for obstruction. The government calculated it in
16
     two ways. It depends on whether the Court accepts that.
17
               THE COURT: The government intends to sentence with
18
     the obstruction of justice?
19
              MS. THOMSON: Yes, your Honor.
20
              THE DEFENDANT: I obstructed justice?
2.1
               THE COURT: Ms. Peebles.
2.2
              MS. PEEBLES: I would like to be heard on that but
23
     I'm not entirely sure whether Mr. Jenkins is wanting me to
24
     speak on his behalf.
```

THE COURT: Mr. Jenkins, would you like Ms. Peebles

2.1

2.2

2.5

to be heard on the offense level calculation with regard to the obstruction of justice enhancement or do you want to address it yourself, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I think I probably should address it myself, too, but I'd like to hear what she has to say.

THE COURT: She's working with you so you're going to have to give her permission, if you want her to address this issue.

MS. PEEBLES: Your Honor, I had an opportunity to review the trial testimony. It's my understanding that the basis for this 2-level enhancement is as a result of Mr. Jenkins taking the stand and testifying. I don't see where it would warrant a 2-level adjustment.

What I saw when I was reading through the transcript, and my understanding of his testimony, was, essentially, him agreeing with everything that the Canadian authorities said when he was crossing the United States border, aside from the fact that he was being — acted nervous and agitated. Other than that, it appeared to me that his testimony coincided with everything that the Canadian authorities were testifying to during the border search.

I didn't see anything in there where he actually denied downloading or possessing or transferring child pornography. It seemed to me that he was talking about

2.1

2.2

2.5

various people having potential access to his computer and hard drives. Then they played a phone call for him, which my understanding of the phone call was the conversation he was having with his parents concerning the number of images and suggesting that there weren't nearly as many images as was initially portrayed.

I don't see, your Honor, where there's a justification for a 2-level enhancement based on that testimony of Mr. Jenkins. It appeared to me that he was essentially in agreement. And I can see in cases where an individual may take the stand and say something totally contrary to what's being offered by the government and the jury rejects that testimony. But in this instance, I didn't see it when I reviewed the trial transcript.

So, it seems to me that it would be unfair to enhance Mr. Jenkins' sentence as a result -- or his Guideline range -- as a result of the testimony that I read during the trial transcripts.

THE COURT: Government like to be heard on this issue?

MS. THOMSON: Your Honor, I did lay out in the government's sentencing memorandum three particular examples that the government believes were examples of the defendant committing perjury and providing material and false information to the Court and jury. I can go over those

1 examples or rest on the papers.

2.1

2.2

2.5

THE COURT: Why don't you go ahead and make your record.

MS. THOMSON: Your Honor, with regard to the first example, the defendant testified on cross-examination that he did not have the three thumb drives, that the thumb drives found in the trunk he knew nothing about them. He didn't have them. They were not his. He was asked repeatedly on cross-examination whether those thumb drives were in his truck and repeatedly said that they were not, that he had no knowledge of them and that they were not his.

However, during the testimony of the forensic examiner Brian Braisted, the examiner testified that those thumb drives had been previously connected to the laptop that was entered into evidence and, so, the defendant's claim that he has no knowledge, that these were not his flies in the face of the evidence that was established in the trial, not to mention the fact that the thumb drives were found in his truck, that he was the only one driving and in his bag that he acknowledged was his.

The second example cited in my memorandum is that on direct examination, he testified that his attorney told him to get rid of his cellular phone and his attorney told him to not show up for his October trial date. He stated that his attorney advised him to break the law and to not go

1 to his own trial in October.

2.1

2.2

2.5

However, later in his testimony, when asked again whether his attorney instructed him not to appear on October 18, 2010, as he had previously testified, he stated that he wasn't told to appear. It's different. The government sought use of that information in our motion in limines and our pretrial discussions of the failure to appear as consciousness of guilt. So the defendant tried to tailor his testimony to fit both circumstances and to try to take away from the evidence establishing consciousness of guilt.

And, third and final, and very important during this trial was the defendant testified that he had employees working for his company, that those employees would come into his home to obtain work orders via fax and email and they would check his email and would check his fax machine at least once a day when he was on vacation. The purpose of his testimony was clear, to show that other people had access to his computer and had access to his home and that those other people could have been responsible for the child pornography that was found on his computer and on his media.

However, on cross-examination, the defendant indicated that -- he was asked about his prior testimony in Canada and in Canada when he was complaining about a delay and about the negative impact that the delay and a speedy trial had on him, he indicated that the work that would be

2.1

2.2

2.5

done with the computers would be work that would be done by him and that he had to actually hire people to do that work because of the restriction that he had without -- that he couldn't use the computer in Canada. Clearly, he tailored his testimony to fit both circumstances.

In Canada it would be beneficial to show how he was prejudiced by not being allowed access to his computer. So in that forum he indicated, I don't have anybody else, it's just me. But during the trial, he tailored his testimony to indicate that there was lots of people that checked his computers. Both of them are not true.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Jenkins, would you like to be heard on this matter before we move on?

MS. PEEBLES: Judge, if I might for a moment.

There were only two thumb drives that had child pornography on it, my understanding was the 4 gigabyte and the 8 gigabyte. And the way I read his testimony was that it seemed as though he said he didn't have knowledge of the thumb drive. I did not see that there was a denial of ownership of the thumb drives, only a denial of whether they were actually in the truck, that he understood them to be in the truck.

But having said that, again, as far as not showing up to the Canadian appearance, the way I read from the lawyer, it almost laid out three options; one which would be

if you didn't show up, they'd issue a warrant, as long as you didn't come back in the country. That was his interpretation. I'm not sure how that was material to the prosecution's case and how that would be a material misstatement, as it didn't have anything to do with whether or not he had child pornography on the computer or the thumb drives.

And then, as far as other people in and out and having access, again, Judge, I read the testimony on cross-examination and direct and, again, I don't see how that was material to whether or not he actually was the person who downloaded the child pornography on the hard drive, other than — I mean, to suggest for a minute that no one would ever possibly have access to his computer, I don't think he said that when he was in Canada trying to explain how his business would be prejudiced.

So, again, Judge, I'm familiar with the testimony. I don't see where it warrants a 2-level obstruction.

Thank you.

2.1

2.5

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Jenkins.

THE DEFENDANT: I didn't have an opportunity to write all that down. But that search was done out of my sight. I didn't see them pull any thumb drives out of any bags. They did connect them to the computers themselves.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

2.5

```
The government's -- the government didn't provide -- I
specifically requested -- and you ignored them and the
government ignored them -- the original CDs from -- that were
supposed to be turned over to my Canadian attorney.
know if he got them or not. I think he did.
                                             That was
supposed to have all the information, technical information
on it and I never got any of that. Those thumb drives were
not connected to the computer before the Canadian government.
The whole concept is absurd. The government didn't provide
           It's readily accessible information. You don't
the dates.
have to be a forensic scientist to figure out when it was.
But the government -- there should have been first and last
dates.
       The government didn't provide them because the
Canadians plugged them in after my arrest. There's files on
the thumb drive that are dated after my arrest. Nothing
makes sense here and nothing -- none of it came out at trial.
That's one of the things -- that's why I demanded a new
attorney. I wanted a retrial. None of it came out. None of
that came out right at trial and it wasn't done to my
satisfaction. And the government suppressed --
         THE COURT: Mr. Jenkins --
         THE DEFENDANT: -- paperwork. They got --
         THE COURT: Mr. Jenkins, I'm asking you about your
trial testimony and the obstruction of justice enhancement.
         THE DEFENDANT: I have to --
```

THE COURT: You'll be given an opportunity to 1 discuss anything else afterwards. 2 3 Right now, sir, do you have anything else to say about the obstruction of justice enhancement? 4 5 THE DEFENDANT: I disagree with it. The testimony -- the government is apparently trying to 6 7 misconstrue some testimony I gave in Canada, which is pretty 8 much what they do. I just said that we had to switch jobs 9 around. I didn't say I had the -- I don't remember exactly 10 what I said. I don't believe I said I had to hire somebody, 11 but I just had to pay people. We had to switch jobs. I know 12 what they're trying to do. They're just trying to 13 misconstrue it and it's... 14 THE COURT: Okay, sir, are you done with regard to 15 that? THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I'm done with that. 16 17 THE COURT: Well, the Court heard the testimony. 18 The Court sat through the trial, obviously, and it was clear 19 to this Court that Mr. Jenkins was trying to, at several 20 points in his testimony, suggest that other people were 2.1 responsible. If there was child pornography on his computer, 22 that he certainly was not responsible and that he did perjure 23 himself at different instances, including the three that the 24 government has cited and in the Court's view other instances 2.5 where he denied being online at certain times and he was

```
challenged by the government with the forensic records of his
 1
 2
     computer of times that he went on the computer and signed on
 3
     with certain passwords, names --
 4
               THE DEFENDANT: There were no --
 5
               THE COURT: -- and suggested that there was, you
     know, a download of child pornography right after that time
 6
 7
     and him denying that he had done that.
               So there was testimony, in this Court's view, at
 8
 9
    various instances throughout his testimony at trial where he
10
    perjured himself. I think it was obvious to this Court and
11
     certainly obvious to the jury.
12
               The criminal history computation.
13
               The government have any objection?
14
               MS. THOMSON: No, your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: Ms. Peebles?
16
               MS. PEEBLES: No, your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: Mr. Jenkins, you want to be heard on
18
     the criminal history computation?
19
               THE DEFENDANT: (No response.)
20
               THE COURT: Do you have any objection --
2.1
               THE DEFENDANT:
                              I'm sorry?
2.2
               THE COURT: -- to your criminal history
23
     computation? Do you understand what that is?
24
               (Discussion held off the record between defendant
2.5
               and attorney.)
```

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: No objection, okay, very well.

The government?

2.1

2.2

2.5

MS. THOMSON: Thank you, your Honor.

During this trial, when the defendant was cross-examined with regard to a recorded phone call, a phone call between the defendant and his father, I think the father made a comment that does the very best job of summarizing the very point that Mr. Jenkins is missing.

During this telephone call the defendant is arguing with his father, a father who has supported him throughout his case. He continues to argue with him and the father says quite poignantly: You should have never had that crap with you and squarely tells the defendant that the position that he's in is of his own doing. That is the philosophy of the father in this case.

The philosophy of the son in this case is that he wants to blame everybody else. It's everyone else's fault but his. He wants it to be about international conspiracies, about falsifying evidence, evidence that he indicates in his submission on September 9, 2014, that the government's case "required evidence to be falsified so their 'special fagots' did as much".

According to the defendant, this case is about this honorable Court conspiring with the government. He indicates

2.1

2.2

2.5

in his November 5th, 2014, submission, "with no idiot lawyer to sabotage the defense, the Court itself began harassing me for several months obstructing, ignoring requests or agreed with whatever incoherent nonsense the government spewed issuing decisions and orders simply to prejudice and gain advantages (prosecutorial) and also praised the dismissed and incompetent attorney for among other things 'an outstanding job'". That's what the defendant wants it to be about.

We've spent a lot of time with dealing with those accusations with the complaint about the double jeopardy, the complaint about the case being in the United States instead of Canada. We've spent a lot of time going over multiple attorneys, going over multiple proceedings.

At the end of the day what this case is about is a man, the defendant, amassing a collection of child pornography, a collection that was so dear to him he couldn't even take a vacation without having it out of his sight, a collection that included the rape, abuse of children. The Court saw those images and the Court only saw a small sliver because that's what was presented at trial to spare the jury and to spare the Court from having to look at his collection, the images he was interested in. That's what this case is about.

The defendant, as I indicated, wants it to be about all those things but he takes it a step even further, a step

1 | that is so low it's hard to even describe.

2.1

2.5

In his September 9, 2014, submission on Page 2 the defendant takes it to the level of indicating, with regard to what was on his computer, "most, by way are 'webcam' videos, they (victims) intentionally produced and broadcast (themselves) over the internet and should be prosecuted (themselves)".

So now it's the children's fault. It's their fault that he had access and made a collection of their abuse. That's a low I haven't really seen yet.

But while we're talking about that, the defendant also makes numerous claims and complaints about double jeopardy, about how unfair it is that he was tried in a court in the United States. He complains that if the matter had stayed in Canada, he would have had exposure that was ten times less than the exposure that he has in the United States.

Your Honor, that is akin to killing your parents and crying orphan. The matter didn't remain in Canada because he chose not to show up for those charges. That was his choice and he can blame the attorneys and he can blame the system all he wants but, like his father indicated, you should have never had that crap with you and when you did, you should have dealt with it, but he didn't, and that's why we're here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.5

And after you remove all of the nonsense, all of the antics, all of the baseless allegations that we've listened to for years, I hope the Court goes back to the core of why we're here. We're here because of his collection of child pornography and, because of that collection and because of all the factors that the Court I know will consider, the 7 sentence should reflect the seriousness of the crime, afford adequate deterrent and, most importantly, show the defendant that he only has himself to blame. 10 The government, as noted in the sentencing 11 memorandum, is seeking a sentence within the Guideline range, as well as the other imposition of restitution as the parties have carefully briefed. We're also seeking the imposition of a fine in the amount of \$20,000 and, of course, the imposition of the special assessment of \$200. 17 Thank you. THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Jenkins, is it your intention to allow Ms. Peebles to be heard before you're heard? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Go ahead, Ms. Peebles. 23 MS. PEEBLES: Your Honor, in my sentencing 24 submission to the Court, I lay out the basis for our request

to ask the Court to depart or vary from the Guideline, which

2.1

2.2

2.5

now has been increased by two levels for the obstruction, primarily because of the culpability of Mr. Jenkins in connection with the actual possession and transport of child pornography.

I know the Court's aware of many individuals that come before this Court that have been charged with similar types of acts and that is the downloading and receipt of child pornography. Typically what we find are tens of thousands of images, sometimes more, a hundred thousand images, as a result of the peer-to-peer software sharing system. We see distribution. We see multiple efforts at sharing and chat rooms. We don't have any of that in this case.

Now, if we leave aside all of the, shall we classify them as antics by Mr. Jenkins and where we are today and some of his concerns with regard to the proceedings, if we leave that aside and look at the actual conduct for what he's here today to be sentenced for, I would suggest that he is at a level, your Honor, on a continuum that is much less than those that are typically before this Court.

I think, your Honor, all things considered, that the sentencing enhancements as we laid out in our sentencing submissions really overinflate the culpability of Mr. Jenkins in the actual possession and transport of child pornography.

I know that there are some issues concerning,

2.1

2.5

obviously, his concern with the proceeding and the process and how we wound up here. But I will say this. I've seen and I've read the letter from his Canadian attorney,

Mr. Edgley, and I refer to it in my sentencing submission and it did say: The third option is that you simply not return to Canada, in which case there would be a bench warrant issued for your arrest and if you ever tried to come to Canada again, you would be subject to arrest pursuant to this warrant and also the money that was posted for bail would be forfeited to her Majesty the Queen and, as we discussed, he would also get his lawyer fee out of that money.

So, he laid it out as option one, option two, and option three. Again, your Honor, I think in hindsight,
Mr. Jenkins would have chose to go to his trial and attend the proceedings in Canada. It would have been the better choice. But he didn't do that for, I believe, the reasons set forth in the letter sent by Mr. Edgley.

Having said that, your Honor, I know Mr. Jenkins has been held in local custody. He's been subjected to a competency evaluation. The psychologist did find that he was competent and that was before the Court. And I don't think, your Honor, that sitting in the local — well, I believe sitting in a local jail for a three-year period has been a struggle for Mr. Jenkins and he's moved around from place to place. It's been a difficult three years for him. This case

has been pending literally from Canada for a five-year period. He was a reputable electrician with no prior criminal history.

2.1

2.5

I think the fact that he had no prior criminal history, your Honor, suggests that the chances that he would be a recidivist is very minimal and I think, your Honor, this entire process has taken its toll on him to the point where we are where we are today and his ability to think clearly and make articulate arguments has somewhat been clouded because of the way in which the process has all unfolded.

I'm not, again, Judge, suggesting that there's merit to some of the arguments that Mr. Jenkins wanted to bring forth with but he's filed those supplemental motions on his own.

But I do think, if the Court considers exactly what he was convicted of by the jury, that a sentence of no more than 5 years would be appropriate in this case because of his lack of criminal history, because of the continuum where he falls, and, also, your Honor, because of the circumstances in which he wound up here.

As far as the restitution goes, your Honor, I think what we've set out in our supplemental sentencing memo lays down the methodology that we believe the Court should implore in terms of deciding what the appropriate amount is in this case, taking into account the *Paroline* factors and the basis

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

2.5

for those arguments, the least amount would be nontrivial in our opinion based on the assessment of taking into account the approach that the Supreme Court suggested, looking at future individual downloaders and also past downloaders in combination are factors that the Court needs to consider in addition to the relative culpability of Mr. Jenkins, as opposed to those that produce and share and distribute those images. And we believe an amount of no more than \$5,000 per victim in this case would certainly satisfy the Paroline factors and that's what we're asking the Court to consider. As far as the fine amount, your Honor, \$20,000 for Mr. Jenkins who doesn't have the resources at this point in time and the reason he didn't fill out the financial affidavit --THE COURT: How do we know that? How do we know what his resources are? He's never cooperated to fill out a financial affidavit. MS. PEEBLES: Well, now he's in a catch 22 since we have the perjury charges pending and, as his lawyer, we would have to advise him to invoke his Fifth Amendment right, which we have, and that's an issue. THE COURT: I understand that.

MS. PEEBLES: Perhaps the Court could reserve

decision on the amount of the fine to impose until the

perjury charges are addressed by the district court and

```
again, Judge, I believe Mr. Jenkins is in somewhat of a catch
1
     22 on that for the --
 2
 3
               THE COURT: Situation created by who?
 4
              THE DEFENDANT: You.
              THE COURT: There you go.
 5
              Go ahead, Ms. Peebles.
 6
 7
              MS. PEEBLES: Yeah. So with that having been said,
    your Honor, I would just ask the Court to consider our
 8
 9
     submissions in that regard and, also, to impose a sentence of
10
     no more than 5 years.
11
               THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Peebles.
12
              Mr. Jenkins, would you like to be heard, sir?
13
              THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I don't think it's...
              THE COURT: If you want to be heard.
14
15
               THE DEFENDANT: I don't remember what the
16
    prosecutor said now. I kind of forgot. I haven't been able
17
    to write anything down.
18
               THE COURT: Sir, if you want to be heard, please
19
     stand up and speak into the microphone. You can be heard.
20
               THE DEFENDANT: You said a lot of stuff about
2.1
     downloading, getting stuff on the computer. That was never
2.2
    proved before or after the other. I'm just so frustrated
23
     right now I can't even think. I couldn't write stuff down
24
     when she was talking. Whatever -- whatever finances they did
```

put on this, the government said they subpoenaed that stuff.

2.5

It wasn't to be used for sentencing purposes or restitution. 1 So I object to anything that they refer to on there being 2 3 used that would determine restitution. And I can't remember what she said now. 4 5 (Discussion held off the record.) THE DEFENDANT: You know, whatever I say doesn't 6 7 make any difference. You made up your mind a long time ago. 8 You made up your mind a long time ago. This is just -- this 9 is just ridiculous. I object to the whole thing. 10 THE COURT: Are you done, sir? 11 THE DEFENDANT: I'm done. 12 THE COURT: Okay. The Court's prepared to impose 13 sentence. The Court has reviewed and considered all the 14 15 pertinent information, including, but not limited to, the 16 presentence investigation report, the addendum, submissions 17 by counsel, the Sentencing Guidelines manual, as well as the 18

factors outlined in 18, U.S.C., Section 3553(a).

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

2.5

The Court adopts the factual information and the Guideline applications contained in the presentence investigation report with the following exception: finds the defendant obstructed justice, the administration of justice at trial as defined in USSG, Section 3C1.1 and, therefore, a 2-level enhancement for his conduct is warranted.

2.1

2.2

2.5

Therefore, the Guideline imprisonment range goes from 168 to 210 months to a Guideline imprisonment range of 210 to 262 months.

Having been convicted at trial of Counts 1 and 2 of the indictment, it is the judgment of the Court that you are hereby committed to the custody of the bureau prisons to be imprisoned for a total term of 225 months.

This term consists of 225 months on Count 1 and 120 months on Count 2 to run concurrently.

The Court finds this sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes of sentencing, after considering the defendant's background, the nature of the offense, and the defendant's behavior before this Court.

This defendant has never even hinted at an acceptance of responsibility, has blamed everybody and everyone for his criminal activity, including the Canadian law enforcement officers, the Canadian court, his attorney in Canada, his attorneys who tried so desperately to help him here in the United States, the prosecution, and even this Court. You've made it extremely clear that, without a doubt, you accept absolutely no responsibility for your actions.

I couldn't disagree with your attorney more when she says that you're not a threat to commit this crime again. You've demonstrated that you have a total lack of respect for

2.1

2.2

2.5

the law and disdain for the law. That's in the Court's view it is without question that, if given the opportunity, you will do exactly what you want to do in any situation and you are a very high risk to reoffend.

You attempted to transport thousands of images and videos of child pornography into Canada and then later failed to appear for your Canadian trial. You attempted to evade justice and when you were arrested in the United States, you blamed Canada. You blamed the U.S. government, law enforcement for doing illegal acts to prosecute you.

Based on your evasion of the charges in Canada, there is an active warrant for your arrest in Canada. You have since demonstrated a total disregard of the law and a complete lack of respect for this Court and any of the attorneys who have tried to help you.

Based on these factors and your large collection of child pornography, the Court has imposed a sentence that reflects the seriousness of your crime, that promotes respect for the law, and that provides you with adequate deterrence from committing further crimes, and that protects the public.

While in custody, the Court recommends you receive mental health treatment and sex offender treatment when, and if, eligible.

With regard to restitution, the defendant shall pay to the victims of this offense pursuant to 18, U.S.C.,

2.1

2.5

Section 2259. The Court finds that, based on the indictment, trial evidence, jury verdict and the government's memorandum of law, the defendant knowingly transported and possessed the images of Vicky, L.S., Cindy and Angela. And I'm referring to docket numbers 10, 151, 152, 154, 178 and 183.

The Court also finds that, based on the government's memorandum of law and exhibits, that each of the four victims has outstanding losses caused by the continuing traffic of their images in the following amounts:

Vicky has outstanding losses of approximately \$500,875.

L.S. has outstanding losses of approximately \$1,841,400.

Cindy has outstanding losses of approximately \$1,344,963.

And Angela has outstanding losses between 366,000 and 587,000.

The Court finds, again, based on the government's memorandum of law and exhibits, that, while it is far from clear that this aggregation is required by *Paroline* in the United States, even assuming that this aggregation is required, the losses attributed solely to the group of traffickers amounts to at least half the victims losses, given that appears it is likely that the public's viewing of the victim's images is the cause of victims losses as it is

that the victims original abusers is the cause of those
losses.

2.1

2.2

2.5

Finally, the Court finds, again, based on the government's memorandum of law and exhibits, that the amounts of restitution that comport with the defendant's relative role in the causal process that underlies each victim's general losses are as follows:

\$3,000 for Vicky; two, \$3,000 for L.S;, three, \$3,000 for Cindy; and, four, \$3,000 for Angela.

The Court notes that it rendered this last finding based on the careful consideration of the factors enumerated in Paroline.

For example, the Court finds that the number of past criminal defendants found to have contributed to the victim's general losses are as follows:

502 with regard to Vicky, 149 with regard to L.S., 123 with regard to Cindy; and 17 with regard to Angela.

The Court finds that there is no evidence before it to support a reasonable prediction of the number of future offenders likely to be caught and convicted for crimes contributing to the victim's general losses, nor is there evidence before it to support a reasonably reliable estimate of the broader number of offenders involved.

The Court finds that the defendant did not reproduce or distribute images of the victims. The Court

finds that the defendant has no connection to the initial production of the images.

The Court finds the defendant possessed the following number of images of the victims:

2.1

2.5

Three videos or 222 images of Vicky; 3 images of L.S., 1 image of Cindy, and 1 image of Angela.

While the defendant's per capita share of Vicky's total losses amounts to only approximately \$500, the Court finds that the amount should be increased to \$3,000 due to, one, the above-average number of images of her that he possessed and, two, the particularly explicit and offensive nature of these images.

While defendant's per capita share of L.S.'s total losses amounts to approximately \$6,138, the Court finds that the amount should be diminished to \$3,000 due to a below-average number of images of her that he possessed; and, two, the fact that the government itself has estimated the defendant's share as \$3,000.

While defendant's per capita share of Cindy's total losses amounts to approximately \$5,423, the Court finds that the amount should be diminished to \$3,000, due to the below-average number of images of her that he possessed; and, two, the fact that the government itself has estimated the defendant's share as \$3,000.

Finally, while the defendant's per capita share of

Angela's losses amounts to between \$20,333 and \$32,611, the 1 2 Court finds that the amount should be diminished to \$3,000 3 due the below-average number of images of her that he possessed and the fact that the government itself has 4 5 estimated the defendant's share at \$3,000. After considering the factors outlined in 18, 6 U.S.C., Section 3664(F)(2), including your financial 7 resources, other assets, restitution is to be paid 8 9 immediately. 10 The Court also finds that, based on your financial 11 resources, projected earnings and your financial obligations, 12 that you do have the ability to pay a fine. Therefore, you 13 shall pay to the clerk of court a fine in the amount of 14 \$40,000, which is due and payable immediately. 15 You shall also pay a special assessment of \$200, 16 which is due immediately. 17 Upon your release from imprisonment, you shall be 18 placed on supervised release for a term of 25 years on each 19 count to run concurrently. 20 While on supervised release, you shall not commit

While on supervised release, you shall not commit another federal, state or local crime. You shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this Court. You shall comply with the following special conditions that have been provided to you and your attorney.

2.1

2.2

23

24

2.5

The Court adopts these special conditions which

```
will be made a part of this record.
1
               Ms. Peebles, did you have an opportunity to review
 2
 3
     those special conditions with Mr. Jenkins prior to this
 4
     proceeding.
 5
               MS. PEEBLES: Yes, your Honor, and we are objecting
     to the imposition of the ten special conditions that have
 6
     been set forth in the addendum.
 7
               THE COURT: Very well, but you did review them with
 8
 9
     him?
10
               MS. PEEBLES: Yes, your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: Mr. Jenkins, you saw those special
12
     conditions prior to these proceedings today?
13
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I believe I did.
14
               THE COURT: Well, sir, you did or you didn't?
15
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I think I did -- yes.
16
               THE COURT: Sir, you need to understand that you're
17
     going to be required to abide by those special conditions
18
     once you're released and you're on supervised release.
19
20
2.1
2.2
               (Special conditions distributed to defendant
23
               and counsel are as follows:)
24
               1. You shall register with the state sex offender
2.5
     registry agency in any state where you reside, are employed,
```

carry on a vocation or are a student.

2.1

2.5

- 2. You shall not have any direct contact with a person under the age of 18 unless it is supervised by a person approved of by the probation officer. You shall not have indirect contact with a person under the age of 18 through another person or through a device (including a telephone, computer, radio, or other means) unless it is supervised by a person approved of by the probation officer. You shall reasonably avoid and remove yourself from situations in which you have any other form of contact with a minor.
- 3. You shall not be in any area in which persons under the age of 18 are likely to congregate, such as school grounds, child care centers, or playgrounds, without the permission of the probation officer.
- 4. You shall participate in a mental health program, which will include, but will not be limited to, participation in a treatment program for sexual disorders.

 The program shall be approved by the United States Probation Office.
- 5. Your supervised release may include examinations using a polygraph, computerized voice stress analyzer, or other similar device to obtain information necessary for supervision, case monitoring, and treatment.

 You shall answer the questions posed during the examination,

2.1

2.2

2.5

subject to your right to challenge in a court of law the use of such statements as violations of your Fifth Amendment rights. In this regard, you shall be deemed to have not waived your Fifth Amendment rights. The results of any examinations shall be disclosed to the United States

Probation Office and the Court, but shall not be further disclosed without the approval of the Court.

- 6. You shall contribute to the cost of any evaluation, testing, treatment and/or monitoring services rendered in an amount to be determined by the probation officer based on your ability to pay and the availability of third-party payments.
- any other device with online capabilities, at any location, except at your place of employment, unless you participate in the Computer Restriction and Monitoring Program. You shall permit the United States Probation Office to conduct periodic, unannounced examinations of any computer equipment you use or possess, limited to all hardware and software related to online use, (e.g., use of the World Wide Web, email, instant messaging, et cetera.) These examinations may include retrieval and copying of data related to online use, and the viewing of pictures and movies which may be potential violations of the terms and conditions of supervised release from this computer equipment including any internal or

2.1

2.2

2.5

external peripherals, internet-capable devices, and data storage media. This computer equipment may be removed to the Probation Office or to the office of their designee for a more thorough examination. The Probation Office may use and/or install any hardware or software system that is needed to monitor your computer use, subject to the limitations described above.

- 8. If your employment requires the use of a computer, you may use a computer in connection with the employment approved by the probation officer, at your place of employment, provided you notify your employer of: (1) the nature of your conviction; and (2) the fact that your conviction was facilitated by the use of the computer. The Probation Office must confirm your compliance with this notification requirement.
- 9. You shall not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer.
- 10. The defendant shall apply all monies he receives from any income tax refunds, lottery winnings, judgments, and/or any other anticipated or unexpected financial gains to the outstanding court-ordered financial obligation.

* * *

THE COURT: You shall also forfeit to the United

States all right, title and interest in the items listed in the forfeiture allegation contained in the indictment and further listed in the special verdict form.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

2.5

Both parties have a right to appeal this sentence in certain limited circumstances. You are advised to consult with your attorney to determine whether or not an appeal is warranted.

Any appeal must be filed within 14 days of the date of the judgment being filed in this case.

Defendant will be remanded to the custody of the United States Marshals in accordance with the terms of this sentence.

(Discussion held off the record between courtroom deputy and the Court.)

THE COURT: I want to make it clear for the record that with the obstruction of justice enhancement, the Court found that the offense level was 37 and the Criminal History Category was I, which gave us the Guideline imprisonment range of 210 to 262 months.

Anything further on behalf of the government?

MS. THOMSON: Your Honor, first I realize that this matter has taken a great deal of the Court's time already, but I would ask if the Court would just allow me to briefly supplement the record with regard to the issue of substitution of counsel, just in the interest of making sure

that the record is complete and that the record reflects the government's position with regard to the substitution of counsel.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

2.1

2.2

2.5

MS. THOMSON: Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, the Court, to have substituted counsel, must have found that there was good cause for that substitution, as the defendant does not have an absolute right to substitution of counsel.

The defendant didn't even make out a showing of good cause in his submissions. If you actually look at what he wrote with regard to counsel, he indicated on Page 2 of his submission, public defender's office had done a better-than-average job litigating within the "pretend subject matter jurisdiction" the Northern District exerts.

He doesn't really explain any bases for the substitution of counsel, other than to go on and say it was wrong for Court to order the defendant to retain private counsel, which previously happened, was wrong to dismiss the attorney, which the Court did at the attorney's request, and that the Court was incompetent and caused financial strain and the Court's CJA panel of attorneys are not qualified or are easily corrupted.

None of the allegations that he set forth or the comments that he made rise to the level of good cause, the

- timeliness of the motion also again with counsel here, the 1 2 Court having allowed him that substitution of counsel. 3 There was no actual nature of a conflict that was explained, just the defendant wanted, yet again, to have 4 5 things delayed so that he may or may not take an action which we've been down that road before. 6 THE COURT: And, as I've indicated, all the 7 defendant's submissions are docketed and they're on the 8 9 record and he certainly agreed to have Ms. Peebles 10 participate this morning and so he has been represented and 11 he's had a fair and fall opportunity to represent himself and 12 the record that he would like. 13 MS. THOMSON: Thank you, your Honor.
- THE COURT: I think that matter is sufficiently covered.
- Ms. Peebles, anything further on behalf of Mr. Jenkins?
 - MS. PEEBLES: No, your Honor.

18

- THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Peebles, for your representation.
- 21 Mr. Jenkins, anything further, sir?
- 22 THE DEFENDANT: I think you're a fraud and I think 23 this whole thing's a fraud. This is ridiculous.
- 24 THE COURT: Okay, sir. Good luck to you.
- 25 THE CLERK: Court is adjourned.

```
Case 5:11-cr-00602-GTS Document 201 Filed 03/02/15 Page 42 of 42
                                                                     42
                    US v. Jenkins - 11-CR-602
                (Proceedings adjourned at 10:56 a.m.)
 1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```